

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/585,714	ZADESKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732	

**All Participants:**

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

(2) Heather M. Molleur.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 16 January 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*That of record.*

Claims discussed:

*All pending.*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Collins et al. (US Pat. 4,550,058)*


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 15+ are allowable because the prior art does not teach applying a liquid solution to the part and then curing the liquid to form a coating. It was proposed that an Examiner's Amdt. which added the applying and curing of a liquid solution directly on the part would overcome the rejection of claims 1+. The Exr. Amdt. is needed because Collins teaches a polyurethane (adhesive layer) directly on the polycarbonate part (see 6:9-22) as amended by applicant's last response. It was agreed that the term polyurethane could also be deleted from claim 1 since it is not needed for allowance of claim 1. Ms. Molleur approved the Exr. Amdt. .